

| | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/614,874 | PETERSEN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Thomas M. Lithgow | 1724 | |

All Participants:

(1) Thomas M. Lithgow.

(2) Mr. Stoneman.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 9 February 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1 and 15

Prior art documents discussed:


none

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Claim 1 was amended to make section c) to be consistent with section d). The agreed upon language is "at least one support means". Claim 15 was amended to clearly recite a proper Markush claim (the word "and" was added. See Ex's Amendment.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner Signature) THGOW
 PATENT EXAMINER

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)